

Response  
Application No. 10/621,318  
Attorney Docket No. 030876

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-9 are pending in the application. Claims 1 is amended

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1-3 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Nishijima et al. (US 7,088,907). Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

**Claim 1:**

Claim 1 is amended to recite, “a multiplexer selectively outputting a plurality of image signals applied from a plurality of cameras concurrently.<sup>1</sup>” Applicants respectfully submit that Nishijima et al., fails to teach or suggest at least the aforementioned recitation of claim 1.

Nishijima et al. relates to a video recording apparatus and method and centralized monitoring recording system, and describes performing long-recording at higher density and associating certain video data with additional data. Further, a composite video image and additional data are recorded onto a video cassette tape while maintaining a correspondence between each reduced video image and additional data. (Nishijima et al.; Abstract).

As illustrated in Fig. 1 of Nishijima et al., the multiplexer is only capable of selecting a singular video signal from a single camera 101. More specifically, in the multiplexer 103, when the input terminal 103a connected to the output terminal 103c is switched to another input terminal 103a at a predetermined timing, an output signal of the A/D converter 102 is outputted as the input video data DIN in a frame unit from the output terminal 103c. (Nishijima et al.;

Response

Application No. 10/621,318  
Attorney Docket No. 030876

column 4, line 67 to column 5, line 5). Contrastingly, the multiplexer of claim 1 selectively outputs a plurality of image signals from a plurality of cameras concurrently.

Further, claim 1 recites, inter alia, “an applier applying at an arbitrary timing a recording request signal to the image signal output from a camera selected by said selector.” Applicants respectfully submit that Nishijima et al. fails to teach or suggest at least the aforementioned feature of claim 1.

The Office Action generally asserts that the aforementioned feature of claim 1 is described within the reference at column 4, lines 63 to column 5, line 14. The cited portion merely describes a scenario wherein when the multiplexer 103 switches to another input terminal 103a at a predetermined timing (to thereby select a video signal from another video camera 101), an output signal of the A/D converter 102 is outputted as the input video data  $D_{IN}$ . Accordingly, video images captured by a specific video camera 101 are intermittently (with intervals in time) supplied to the video recording apparatus 200.

To further clarify the “intermittently” verbiage within the cited portion of Nishijima et al., a review of Figs. 3A to 3E is required. As illustrated in Figs. 3A to 3E of Nishijima et al., video images from four cameras 101 are inputted and a composite video image is generated. Further, each of Figs. 3A to 3E illustrates a series of video frames obtained from the video cameras 101 and Fig. 3E illustrates a series of generated composite video frames. Also, each of the block elements of Figs. 3A to 3D represents one frame. (Nishijima et al.; column 6, lines 22-28).

Response

Application No. 10/621,318  
Attorney Docket No. 030876

The video frame on the right side in each of the aforementioned diagrams of Nishijima et al. is preceding with respect to time. As illustrated in the diagrams, when attention is paid to each of the video cameras 101, it is understood that a video frame from one video camera 101 is supplied intermittently (every four frames). (Nishijima et al.; column 6, lines 22-28). In view of the foregoing, the “intermittently” verbiage relates to the video image capture from each of the video cameras as it is applied to further generate the composite video image. Therefore, Nishijima et al. fails to teach or suggest at least the recitation of claim 1, inter alia, “an applier applying at an arbitrary timing a recording request signal to the image signal output from a camera selected by said selector.”

The failure of Nishijima et al. to meet the aforementioned feature of claim 1 is not surprising since the specification of the present application describes a similar scenario wherein the conventional art utilizes a fixed extraction cycle of the image signal. More specifically, the conventional art discussed in the specification requires a multiplexer selecting each of a plurality of cameras by a predetermined number of frames in a time-division manner and extracts in a predetermined cycle an image signal output from a selected surveillance camera.

Furthermore, a recording apparatus records the image signal output from the multiplexer in a recording medium such as a videotape. However, because the recording medium utilized in the conventional art is a video tape, an extraction cycle of the image signal has to be fixed and therefore, it becomes impossible to arbitrarily change the extraction cycle of every camera. Although the cited reference describes utilizing a video tape primarily, it does indicate that a

**Response**

Application No. 10/621,318  
Attorney Docket No. 030876

disc-shaped recording medium such as a hard disc or a magneto-optical disc may be used. (Nishijima et al.; column 7, lines 20-21). However, the cited reference still fails to describe as recited in claim 1, “an applier applying at an arbitrary timing a recording request signal to the image signal output from a camera selected by the selector.” Instead, a fixed extraction cycle of the image signal is described.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Applicants submit that the accepter of claim 2 is described at page 21, lines 15-17 of the specification of the present application which states, “The main CPU 26 of the multiplexer 14 operates according to flowcharts shown in Figure 16 to Figure 23. It is noted that a control program corresponding to the flowcharts is stored in a ROM 26e.”

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicants submit that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicants request such action at an early date.

Response  
Application No. 10/621,318  
Attorney Docket No. 030876

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

An Information Disclosure Statement is forth-coming in the near future. The Examiner is requested to acknowledge consideration of the documents submitted at that time with the next office communication.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,  
**WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP**



Joseph W. Iskra  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 57,485  
Telephone: (202) 822-1100  
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

TEB/JWI/klf